

## **REMARKS**

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Claims 1, 3-11 and 13 have been amended. Claim 2 has been cancelled. Thus claims 1 and 3-13 are pending in the present application. No new matter has been added. In view of the above amendments and following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

### **II. THE INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

The Examiner has not considered the listing of references in the Search Report as an information disclosure statement (IDS) complying with 37 CFR 1.98. Applicants submit a new information disclosure statement with this office action in accordance with the rules.

### **III. THE CLAIM OBJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN**

Claim 7 stands objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. (See 11/12/2008 Office Action p. 2-3).

Claim 7 has been amended to recite "A cyclonic separator according to claim 1, the means for causing the airflow to follow a cyclonic flow pattern through the separating chamber including a plurality of circumferentially distributed blades for imparting tangential velocity to said airflow." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the claim objection be withdrawn.

#### IV. THE 35 U.S.C. § 112 REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 5, 10, 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. (See 11/12/2008 Office Action, pp. 3.)

The Examiner asserts that claim 5 lacks an antecedent basis for “said at least one divided drum.” Claim 5 depends from claim 4 which recites “[a] cyclonic separator according to claim 3, wherein an exit opening of the inlet and an entry opening of the outlet face in axially opposite directions, and wherein *at least one divider drum* situated in, and coaxial with, the separating chamber shields the entry opening of the outlet from the exit opening of the inlet.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation in claim 5 does not lack an antecedent basis.

The Examiner asserts that claims 10 and 11 lack an antecedent basis for “the at least one entry portion of the outlet.” Claims 10 and 11 have been amended to recite “the at least one entry of the outlet.” Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1 which recites, *inter alia*, “an outlet for letting a flow of air, from which at least a portion of the entrained particles and/or liquids has been separated, out of the separating chamber, *the outlet having at least one entry*.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the recitation in claims 10 and 11 do not lack an antecedent basis.

#### V. THE 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) REJECTIONS SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,655,058 to Novak (hereinafter “Novak”). (See 11/12/2008 Office Action p. 4-6).

Novak describes a filtration apparatus which includes a rotating filter, a compressor for providing a positive flow to the rotating filter and an expander for extracting energy from the fluid after it has been filtered. (See Novak Abstract). Novak states that “[t]he present invention basically relies upon centrifugal motion.” (See Novak, col. 1, ll. 16-17). Novak further states that “swirling of the fluid medium aids in the separation of particles by centrifugal force prior to

the particle laden fluid (e.g. air and oil) impinging on the filter material.” (See Novak, col. 2, ll. 66-68).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the limitations of cancelled claim 2. Specifically, claim 1 now recites “wherein the inlet and the outlet enter and leave, respectively, the separating chamber coaxially with the axis of rotation of the drum bounding the separating chamber.” The Examiner in rejecting claim 2, asserted that Novak teaches the recitation of claim 2. (See 11/12/2008 Office Action p. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Novak clearly shows outlet ports 12 that are perpendicular to an axis of rotation of rotating cone 20 and perpendicular to the inlet 10. (See Novak, col. 2, lines 19-21; col. 2, lines 41-43; Figs 1 and 5). Thus, Novak neither teaches nor suggests “wherein the inlet and the outlet enter and leave, respectively, the separating chamber coaxially with the axis of rotation of the drum bounding the separating chamber.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Novak does not teach or describe the recitation in claim 1. Because claims 3-13 include all the limitations of claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also allowable for at least the same reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: February 9, 2008

By:   
Michael Marciniak (Reg. No. 48,198)

Fay Kaplun & Marciniak, LLP  
150 Broadway, Suite 702  
New York, NY 10038  
Phone: 212-619-6000  
Fax: 212-619-0276